



MODERNISM
WITH THE MASK OFF



REV. W. G. BENNETT

Gould
BT
78
B46

GOULD LIBRARY
EASTERN NAZARENE COLLEGE

MODERNISM WITH THE MASK OFF

By

W. G. BENNETT

Author of

The Supreme Command of Jesus,
The Queen Esther Circle,
and other Devotional Themes.
Do Christians Commit Sin?
Love Never Fails

NAZARENE PUBLISHING HOUSE
2923 TROOST AVE., KANSAS CITY, MO.

Copyright, 1928,
By
W. G. Bennett

David
BT
78
B46

DEDICATION

To my sons, Evan and Robert, who were my personal companions and a great comfort in much loneliness, and upon one of whom I trust my mantle may some time fall, this little volume is affectionately dedicated.

THE AUTHOR.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015

INTRODUCTION

I have just finished reading the manuscript, "Modernism with the Mask Off," from the pen of my good friend, the Rev. W. G. Bennett, and am asked to bring a word of introduction. It is a pleasure, as well as responsibility to do so. The book is what the title suggests, an unmasking of modernism. It is condensed, has no irrelevant matter, and can be read by the busy man. My prayer is that it may be read by just such persons. A unique feature of the book is that, like the slothful servant of the past, the Modernists are "condemned out of their own mouths." The bald statements that are herein produced from their teachings are their own refutation, and as it has been said of the gospel, "all it needs is to be told." So all that modernism needs to be rejected by devout people, is to have the plain unvarnished facts as are here put forth. Brother Bennett has wrought a good work in this, his labor of love. Let it become one of the hand-books for the common people, and an instrument of 'torture' to the modernist. The author has my warmest thanks, as he has my profoundest confidence and esteem.

J. L. BRASHER,
Attalla, Alabama.



FOREWORD

Through many years of experience the Author has been confirmed in the faith that "There is a Divinity that shapes our ends, rough hew them as we will." I began my ministry the year that the late Dr. Pearson announced his position relative to miracles in the Garrett Biblical Institute. He was at once compelled to resign his position as professor in that institution, and I understand he later united with the Unitarian church.

This brought from many of the strong leaders of Methodism protests that would seem to warn all such offenders that Methodist doctrine could not be trampled upon, and the offenders escape unchallenged.

But like Banquo's ghost the thing simply would not down. It was asserted that destructive Higher Criticism was the finding of the very highest scholarship, and hinted that anyone who refused to investigate must ever remain an ignoramus. It was also stated, by those in high authority, "that even if we accepted the conclusions of destructive higher criticism, we were not losing the great fundamentals of orthodox Christianity." As a result, we began to investigate. We soon discovered that to accept the teachings of the critics, was to arrive at the same conclusions reached by such men as Thomas Paine, Robert Ingersoll and others of that type. We further discovered that the teaching was far more dangerous than outspoken infidelity, because in many things it seemed to be so beautiful and to hold such high standards of ethics.

Later, it began to dawn on us that while they claimed the very highest authority in scholarship, they proved

nothing, and that they were wide apart in the various conclusions they claimed to have reached, and then stated as final proof of these several different conclusions, that such was the finding of scholarship. Statements, like "it is reasonable to suppose," or, "scholarship says so and so," was quite largely their stock in trade. In other words, they assumed their premise, and then argued to their conclusion; that is, if certain evolutionary theories, were true, then their conclusions were, to say the least, quite reasonable. But a little investigation showed that the supposed scientific theory of evolution was founded on speculation rather than upon fact. And this was and is admitted by many actual investigators, who themselves claimed to be evolutionists.

And thus we were unconsciously being prepared to have some part in one of the most awful conflicts that has ever been waged between truth and error. We refer to the conflict between modernism and fundamentalism. Terms that, though not clearly defined, have come to be expressive of a conflict, the lines of which are clearly drawn, and the outcome of which is as awful as eternity itself. Beware of the man who proclaims himself as neither modernist nor fundamentalist, for if there is one thing fundamental to modernism, it is that nothing is fundamental; nothing is at stake, modernism is simply an old system of truth cast in a new mold. There are, however, two things about which modernists are certain. One is that orthodox Christianity should accept their entire program from premise to conclusion, on the grounds of their pretentions of scholarship. In other words, orthodox Christianity has no rights that modernists are bound to respect. It assumes that orthodoxy has formulated a system of doctrine which was only the ravings

of ignoramuses and fanatics, and when men of modern, scholastic attainments speak, all former conclusions are to be thrown into the scrap heap; their word is final, and now no one has a right to even question or investigate, unless his investigations are in harmony with the conclusion reached by them. To their minds there are no certainties in orthodox Christianity. The Bible contains the word of God, which, of course, means that it also contains error. Man did not fall, man is an evolving creature. Jesus is Divine, but of course all men are Divine, as all had the same origin. Vicarious atonement is a hoax, for man is constructed on an ascending scale, and needs no redemption. The old notion of the Bible being an infallible guide in ethics is foolishness. Man develops his own system of ethics in harmony with his progressing moral development. The old idea that the Bible is a guide to heaven may be all right with an undeveloped human race, but with the present scholastic attainments we know that the roads don't fork. There is but one road, onward and upward. In other words, Modernists are certain that everything that orthodox Christianity has regarded as certain since the days of the Reformation, is uncertain and most of it foolishness. The other thing about which they seem to be certain is, that they have a perfect right to propagate their theories in orthodox congregations and institutions, while orthodox money pays the bills. And further, that orthodox ministers have no right to protest or charge them with heresy and that if they do protest, they are unchristian and un-Christ-like. Of these things they seem to be certain. Our Modernists seem to forget that Jesus said, "I come not to send peace on earth, but a sword."

We find among those who would plead for conciliation, statements like, "Truth needs no defense." The Bible will take care of itself, etc. I certainly believe in the ultimate triumph of truth, but truth nevertheless requires true men for its propagation and defense. I am not alarmed as to what shall become of the Bible. The Bible has been the subject of many of the greatest conflicts of past ages, and has come forth from every conflict more than conqueror. I am concerned about what shall happen to the destructive higher critics, and I want to do all I can to hurry it up. I am anxious about the multitudes that they are deceiving with their unfounded philosophical speculations and their deceitful propaganda. And I am in hopes that in this very brief treatise I can reveal to many who have not the time to give to a more thorough investigation, that modernism is a false philosophy, that it has no foundation; in fact, that it is not Christianity in any sense of the word, that it is subversive of all morals and religious ideals, that to be deceived by it is to be lost. And that if our civilization adopts its teachings, the world will drift back to heathenism.

In presenting this little booklet to the reading public, we are not laying claim to originality. We have culled from sources too numerous to mention. We have only attempted a brief compilation for the hurried reading of busy people, and high school scholars who have not time to make a more thorough investigation. We have not attempted an exhaustive treatment of the subjects discussed. Others have done that far better than we are capable of doing. In our treatment of evolution we have only tried to cover the main points at issue. There are others not discussed. But if evolution cannot account for the origin of matter, the origin of life and prove the trans-

mutation of species, then evolution is a witness whose testimony must be thrown out of court, like the plea of the Irishman who declared that he could give fifteen reasons why his father had not appeared for trial, and made the answering fourteen of them unnecessary, by stating that to begin with his father had died six weeks before court sat. The judge declared that the first reason was sufficient. If evolution cannot give an account of itself in the answering of the first three questions fundamental to its credibility, it is useless to question it further.

If the position that we have taken, that modernism is not Christianity in any sense of the word, seems to some to be harsh and extreme, we apologize by saying we have not meant to be critical or unkind, but we have taken that position after the most careful consideration; because it seems to us, in view of the facts, to be inevitable. The entire Christian system centers in the fact that Christ's death was a vicarious atonement for sin. And the entire position of modernism can finally be summed up in the statement that man is not a sinful, but an ascending creature, and needs no redemption, in the sense of vicarious atonement.

THE AUTHOR.

MODERNISM WITH THE MASK OFF

CHAPTER I

THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION DEFINED AND REFUTED

The term modernism at once brings to our minds something fully up to date. We, in our day, have come into the heritage of all past accumulated and formulated knowledge. Our philosophy should be the very best. Our science, where we have arrived at conclusions, ought to be rock-ribbed and certain. Our piety and our religious conclusions might reasonably be expected to be the best of the ages. All of this modernism claims to be. To hear modernism boast of its scholastic training, its scientific investigations and the scientific facts of which it is supposed to be in possession, one might suppose that all of its conclusions have reached one finale; that its ethics are above reproach; that its piety is without fault; that it has spoken the final word relative to God, the soul, present standards of righteousness, divine revelation and the hereafter. If we take its word for it, modernism is a giant with shining coat of mail, with limbs of iron, sinews of steel, trunk of righteousness, crowned with the head of a philosopher, the wisdom of a sage, the keenness of an attorney, and the vision of a prophet, marching down the rock-ribbed highway of eternal truth, whose mission is to lead benighted humanity to the city of eternal light and happiness.

An aged maiden lady ordered inscribed on her tombstone these significant words, "As you are now, so once was I. As I am now you soon will be. Prepare, my friend, to follow me." A miscreant wag scribbled underneath this beautiful epitaph these words, "To follow thee I am not content until I know which way thee went." With all the boasted knowledge of this apparent giant of modernism, we are not quite ready to follow him until we have made some further investigations. When we take the mask off of our supposed giant, the trunk is only a pipe dream, the brain cavity is filled with hot air. The only substantial thing about our giant is his mouth with which "he speaks great swelling words." He is on the quicksands; the only reason he has not sunken before is due to his lack of weight. His conclusions are unproven. His goal is the abyss.

It is so generally admitted that evolution is the foundation of modernism, that proof of this statement is unnecessary. It may be occasionally denied but is very generally admitted. If evolution were a scientific fact, as is so frequently asserted by modernists, then modernism, would at least seem to be a very reasonable conclusion. But the fact that modernists frequently assert that evolution is a scientific fact does not necessarily establish it as such. Some of us who have noticed that modernists frequently pass themselves off for fundamentalists when wisdom seems to make that the wisest course of procedure would naturally demand some other proof of the theory of evolution than just the bare statement of the modernists.

Dr. Mains, of New York, the author of a book in which he attempts to overthrow the traditional views of the church to which he belongs, says that the theory of

evolution is about as well established as the law of gravitation. This is a pitiful begging of the question, and an adroit attempt to make it appear that investigation is unnecessary. Anyone who will look our modernist giant in the face and ask a very few simple questions on the supposed fact of evolution will discover immediately that he has no answer.

EVOLUTION DEFINED

We propose now to give you a definition of evolution from the very highest authorities on scientific subjects:

Le Conte says, "Evolution is (1) a continuous progressive change, (2) according to certain laws, (3) by means of resident forces." "The process pervades the whole universe, the doctrine covers alike every department of science."

Cope, a leading defender of the theory, defines evolution as "The doctrine that creation has been accomplished. . . . by the agencies of energies which are intrinsic to the evolving matter, and without the interference of agencies external to it." God is left out; He is neither wanted nor needed.

Haeckel, the German scientist who, since the time of Darwin's death, and up to his own decease, was evolution's greatest advocate, says that evolution is "that struggle for existence in which Nature produces new species without design." He also states that it excludes every supernatural process. "Nothing will make the theory clearer than calling it a non-miraculous theory of creation."

Spencer defines it thus: "Evolution is a continuous change from indefinite, incoherent homogeneity to a definite coherent heterogeneity of structure and function through successive differentiations and integrations."

Haeckel also says that Darwin sounded the death knell of the theory of creation.

Professor Pfliegerer, a German scholar of the beginning of this century, said, "When we say evolution we definitely deny creation and when we say creation we definitely deny evolution."

Tyndall says, "Strip it naked and you stand face to face with the notion that not only the more noble forms of the horse and the lion, not only the exquisite mechanism of the human body, but the human mind with its emotions, intellect, will and all their phenomena were latent in that fiery cloud."

It will appear from the foregoing definitions that evolution as a scientific theory, organic evolution, has to do not only with development, but with creation and with the origin of species.

WHERE DID MATTER COME FROM?

Suppose you ask the advocates of evolution where matter and energy came from and how they are sustained. There was the nebular hypothesis. But on this theory scientists were never quite agreed. Herbert Spencer asserted that the original substance was cold cloud, and heated as it contracted, but Mr. Tyndall said it was fire mist and cooled as it contracted. These theories have become obsolete with most scientists. It is now quite generally admitted in scientific circles that the basic element of all substance is electrons. Sir Oliver Lodge says, "Imagine an atom, as compared in size, to a building 80 feet long, 60 feet wide and 40 feet high. In this atom would be 250 electrons, in size compared to the point of a pin." Evidently the greater part of the atom is space. Someone has defined an electron as electricity in extreme

agitation. Consequently what we have always supposed to be the solid substance of matter is simply electrons in rapid motion. Of course, to be a scientist you must use your imagination freely. But I would advise for the present at least, until further proof is forthcoming, that for all practical purposes you still regard matter as solid substance. It may save you from serious misfortune even if it should not prove to be a scientific fact. But remember we are not rejecting this postulate of science for there is no reason for our doing so. That is, we have no proof to the contrary.

We want now to call attention to the principle of the conservation of energy; a law that would seem to be well established in science, that is, if science can establish anything. This law demands that nothing be lost. Forms of energy can be changed but the resident quantity must be conserved. Quoting from "Evolution Has Failed:" "Decomposition and transformation is by loss and not by gain. There is a change from the greater to the less, from the stronger to the weaker, but the reverse process as demanded by evolution never occurs." Evolution always means from a lower to a higher. Matter is decaying. Energy and force are decreasing.

In a conversation with a gentleman who had spent his life in the study and personal investigation of geology and had attempted at least to press his investigations to a finality, I asked this question, "Is it your opinion as a scientist that the Bible is right when it says, relative to the planets, 'As a vesture shalt thou fold them up and they shall be changed'?" He was thoughtful a moment and then said, "Yes, it is not only my opinion, it is inevitable. Everything in geology points to the fact that the earth is growing old." He then remarked, "When I

was a boy, every night my Quaker grandmother had me read a chapter in the Bible before retiring. She believed, and I was taught to believe that the Bible was the infallible word of God. When a student in college, I was told I would have to give up those old foggy notions, but I pursued my studies. I have seen difficulties pile up mountain high before me, but I have gone on with my investigations only to see them melt away like the western snowbanks before the chinook winds of spring time, and my faith in the infallible records of the old book has become stronger than ever."

Quoting again from "Evolution Has Failed"—"The universe may be compared to a huge mechanism, balanced and controlled by a massive spring, which, in the beginning, was arranged by the master mind and wound by the master hand, God, its creator. As time flies on and as the ages pass, the spring is slowly unwinding and losing its elasticity; this perfectly and beautifully adjusted machine through the wear and tear of millenniums is falling to pieces and the universe is coming to naught. It began in the extreme concentration of matter; it will end in nebulosity. It began as a universe capable of life; it will end in eternal night and death."

THE ORIGIN OF LIFE

The next question for evolution to answer is where did life come from? Here our supposed intellectual giant again begins to evade. Perhaps he will say there was a time when life could be spontaneously generated on this planet, but this again contradicts other postulates of evolution and admits degeneration. He may answer that life germs might have fallen upon our planet from some other planet but this conflicts with the known laws of

gravitation. Besides how came it that life germs existed on some other planet and not upon this one? He may say, like a professor at Chicago University said recently, that he believed that life would yet be produced in the chemical laboratory. But this is sheer speculation and has been proved false if anything can be proven false.

Tyndall perhaps made the most thorough investigation of the theory of spontaneous generation that ever has been made. Hear the results of his investigations in his own words. Tyndall after laborious experiments during eight months, thus candidly states in an address before the Royal Institute in London: "From the beginning to the end of the inquiry there is not, as you have seen, a shadow of evidence in favor of the doctrine of spontaneous generation. In the lowest, as well as in the highest organized creatures, the method of nature is that life shall be the issue of antecedent life." Huxley also admitted, "The doctrine that life can only come from life is victorious all along the line." Professor Conn states, "There is not the slightest evidence that living matter could arise from non-living matter." Spontaneous generation of life is now discarded by all competent scientists.

TRANSMUTATION OF SPECIES

We will next ask our Scientists to produce evidence that one distinct species has ever been produced from another distinct species. Here again they try to evade the issue by assuming that evolution is simply unfolding or development. But, if evolution is to account for the origin of species without a divine creator then it must prove not only development of species but transmutation of species—or that a species has been produced from a species entirely distinct from the one from which it orig-

inated and for this no well informed scientist will contend for it is, up to the present time, without verification. Darwin himself writes, "Now it is difficult, perhaps impossible, to bring forth one case of hybrid offspring of two animals clearly distinct being fertile." And further states: "We cannot prove that a single species has been changed."

Professor Winchell: "The great stubborn fact is . . . we are ignorant of a single good species coming from another one. The world has been ransacked for the example . . . the long sought experimentum crucis has not been discovered."

Huxley, "The great problem of evolution is a theory of derivation. It is our clear conviction that, as the evidence now stands, it is not absolutely proved that a group of animals having all the characteristics of a species in nature, has ever been originated by selection, whether natural or artificial.

Professor Conn, "It is true enough that naturalists have been unable to find a single instance of a new species. No unquestioned instance has been observed of one species being derived from another."

Sir David Brewster, "We have absolute proof of the immutability of species whether we search for it in history or geological times."

Someone may refer to pithcanthropus erectus which is the most popular relic with evolutionists. It consists of a piece of skull from the eyes upward, a leg bone and two teeth. Anyone who will investigate the facts relative to this creature and the different opinions given relative to it by different scientists must be convinced that the entire matter is too ludicrous for serious persons to pay any attention to, although Haeckel claims it as the

missing link, and says that this demonstrates the truth of evolution.

Dr. Etheridge, Examiner of the British museum, said to Dr. George E. Post, in answer to a question, "In all this great museum there is not a particle of evidence of the transmutation of species. This museum is full of proofs of the utter falsity of these views."

Mr. Darwin, "There are two or three million of species on earth, sufficient field, one might think, for observation. But it must be said today that, in spite of all the efforts of trained observers, not one change of species into another is on record." (Life and Letters, Vol. III., P. 25).

Dr. N. S. Shaler, Professor of Geology in Harvard, asserts that it has not been proved that a single species has been established solely or even mainly by the operation of natural selection.

EVOLUTION IN QUESTION BY MANY EMINENT SCIENTISTS

The following quotations will show that men who are themselves scientists and have conducted personal investigations are much less likely to claim evolution as an established fact than are men who are simply teachers of science or exponents of modernism.

The late Professor Haeckel complains bitterly of the opposition of many of the scientists of Europe and that many once with him have deserted him.

Sir Roderick Murchison said: "I know as much of nature in her geologic ages as any living man and I fearlessly say that our geologic record does not afford one syllable of evidence in support of Darwin's theory."

Dr. J. Clark Ridpath said: "The eagle was always an eagle, the man was always man. Every species of living

organism has, I believe, come up by a like process from its own primordial germ."

Mr. Batson said recently at the American Association for the Advancement of Science meeting in Toronto, Canada: "It is impossible for scientists any longer to agree with Charles Darwin's theory of the origin of species."

Sir James Dawson says: "All things left to themselves degenerate," and asserts further that the Darwinian theory of the origin of species is "utterly destitute of proof."

St. George Miveret of the University College, Kensington, says: "With regard to the conception put forth by Mr. Darwin, I cannot call it anything but a puerile hypothesis."

John Ruskin said: "I have never heard one logical argument in its favor."

The late Professor George Frederick Wright of Oberlin says: "The history of science is little else than one of discarded theories . . . The so-called science of the present day is largely going the way so steadily followed in the past. The things about which true science is certain are very few and could be contained in a short chapter of a small book."

Professor Conn, in one of the most recent works upon evolution says: "It is true enough that naturalists have been unable to find a single unquestioned instance of a new species."

Professor Fleishmann of Erlanger says, "It has not a single fact to confirm it in the realm of nature."

Even Haeckel himself, before his death, says, "Most modern investigators of science have come to the conclusion that evolution is an error and cannot be maintained."

Professor Wundt, the world's greatest physiological psychologist, in his later years has turned from evolution and is characterizing his former books on this subject as the "crime of my youth," from "Evolution Has Failed."

Professor Zoekler, University of Grifswald says, "The claim that this hypothesis is secured scientifically must most decidedly be denied."

Dr. E. Dennert says that "we are actually witnessing its death struggle."

Professor Lionel S. Beale, King's College, London, as to this theory, says, "There is not at this time a shadow of scientific evidence in its favor."

Virchow of Berlin, formerly one of the world's foremost chemists, said, "It is all nonsense . . . All scientific knowledge has proceeded in the opposite direction."

Tyndall said, "I hold with Virchow that the failure has been so lamentable that the doctrine is utterly discredited."

Conn, an evolutionist, says, "Nothing has been positively proved as to the question at issue. The difficulties offered to an unhesitating acceptance of evolution . . . have grown greater."

Dr. Rudolph Schmidt says, "All these theories have not passed beyond the rank of hypothesis."

Professor Whitney, Yale University, says, "We cannot think the theory yet converted into a scientific fact."

Tyndall also says, "Those who held this doctrine are by no means ignorant of their data and they yield to it only a provisional assent."

Dr. D. S. Gregory of New York, editor of the *Homiletic Review*, and in a position to know the facts, vouches for the statement that "it is a strange fact that no great scientific authority in Great Britain in exact science,

science that reduces its conclusions to mathematical formulae, has endorsed evolution."

Dr. J. A. Zahm, quotes Cardinal Wiseman as saying, "The French Institute in 1860 could count more than eighty scientific theories opposed to Scripture, not one of which has stood still or deserves to be recorded."

Dr. Robert Watts says, "The record of the rocks knows nothing of the evolution of a higher from a lower form. Both nature and revelation proclaim it as an inviolable law that like produces like."

Dr. J. B. Warren, of the University of California, said recently, "If the theory of evolution be true, then, during the many thousands of years covered in whole or in part by present human knowledge, there would certainly be known at least a few instances of the evolution of one species from another. No such instance is known."

Lord Kelvin is on record as saying, "There is not a single ascertained fact of science which conflicts with any statement of the Bible."

Yet, in the face of this array of evidence from the leading scientists of the world, modernists are constantly asserting that scholarship is all on the side of modernism; that modernism has a vast array of scholarship among its advocates we would not attempt to deny. Nevertheless, we assert, considering the array of evidence just produced, that modernism is a false philosophy founded upon a false scientific theory and hence our supposed giant has neither the head of a philosopher, the wisdom of a sage nor the keenness of a scientific investigator. We further assert that it is unchristian and a subversion of all principles of vital religion and of all the best moral interests of the world.

Some one may inquire what about theistic evolution

which of course means that evolution is simply a method by which God created. My reply is that, first, the best scientific authorities are against it and assert that to admit a Divine Creator and fiat creation is to deny evolution. And their assertion is that evolution is creation by forces that are intrinsic to evolving matter.

Second, God is omnipotent and of course could bring the order that is so apparent in nature out of Herbert Spencer's cold cloud, Tyndall's fire mist, or perhaps the more recent theory of one primal cell. But personally this would be much more difficult for me to believe than the simple statement of direct creation as given in the Bible. And further, when we once admit the God of the Bible, the direct fiat creation as taught in both Old and New Testaments becomes a very simple affair. And here it might be appropriate to ask why all this effort to establish a theory of creation contrary to the teaching of the Bible? There can be but one reply, and that is that it is an effort to destroy the infallible credibility of the Word of God. Simply because some of its teaching is repugnant to pleasure loving, worldly minded people who do not want to repent and who have the greatest reasons to fear the retributions therein recorded. We do not refer here to scientific investigations, but to modernists.

EVOLUTION CONTRARY TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE HUMAN MIND

Sir Walter Hamilton enlarged the field of intuitive knowledge making it to include those faculties by which man comes into fellowship with his Creator, but strictly speaking there are but three axiomatic truths, time, space, and that every effect must have an adequate cause. In your imagination you can obliterate every ob-

ject of creation and imagine a time when no thing or created being existed. But when you attempt to imagine a condition where neither time nor space existed the mind staggers and reels. It is an absurdity.

The other intuitive truth is that every effect must have an adequate cause, and evolution which means creation without God is contrary to the constitution of the human mind, and hence, an absurdity. Of course, with evolution where it is used to denote the development of the intellectual faculties, the accumulation of human knowledge, inventive genius, or the improvement of species, plant life, etc., we have no quarrel, except to say that all these improvements require the genius and effort of man, and when this human effort is withdrawn, degeneration and not evolution seems to be the natural law.

To suppose that the marvelous inventions of the ages, all the great railroad systems of the continents, all the ships that plow the seas, all the intricate and gigantic commercial systems of the world evolved into their present condition and continue to operate without the master minds of men, would be no greater absurdity than to suppose that all the swiftly moving planets of the universe, that our earth with its teeming vegetable and animate life, the law of which is everything after its kind, could have come into existence and could continue to function without an omnipotent God.

CHAPTER II

MODERNISM, ITS TEACHING, AND THE CONCLUSIONS TO WHICH IT INEVITABLY LEADS

Our first charge to bring against modernism is that it has no God in the Christian or Bible sense of the word, and I shall now quote from modernists to prove this statement.

Richard La Rue Swain, in "What and Where is God?" (Page 48): "He is a loving intelligent Will. And apart from His instruments He is silent and invisible, here and ever, now and always."

(Page 125) "As to Jesus—no matter what our conception of the trinity in God's personality may be, God is capable of uniting with every man in the same way that he united with the man Jesus." (Page 63) "There could no more be a God without a world than a world without a God."

(Page 66) "All the vitality in the quivering beams of ships and all the propelling force in their engines is but the power of a will, and that will is the Father of our Spirits." (Page 68) "This creative will is what the intelligent Christian means by God." (No it isn't; speak for yourself, Mr. Swain!)

(Page 73) "Our early brothers were trying to interpret God who was as present to them as he is to us." (Yes, we admit that Mr. Swain is simply a heathen philosopher and he admits the same). "Its grip is that of the uni-

verse." (He asserts a personal God—but hear it; his God is an IT).

(Page 74) "We call it God; we think it is loving intelligent will." (In this task modern knowledge is the Christian's best ally). This man exalts modern knowledge above revelation and then rejects Divine Revelation. This man says—Page 76—"To know man is to know God." Jesus says that to know him is to know God. I take Jesus. Take Swain if you want to. He says further, "So far as we can understand the sinless man-soul lifted to the infinite power would be the same as God." This is identical with Mormonism.

(Page 83) "This man is a modern evolutionist."

(Page 89) "The world is as ignorant of man as it is of God."

"And the prevailing idea of either is a caricature." Too bad that Mr. Swain was not born long ago. How ignorant we all were until he arrived. Swain is a pantheist, soul and body are identical with him. (See page 90).

(Page 140) "All things proceed from nature or God" Mrs. Eddy would say good or God; and this man's philosophy is very near akin to Mrs. Eddy's.

(Page 105) "If God could come to articulate speech and deed through but one physical instrument, He and all his family might well disappear." (Thus he denies the incarnation of Jesus.)

(Page 112) "Neither God nor any part of God ever goes or comes." (This positively disputes Jesus. John 13:3.) He said that he came from God and went to God. Further, "Beyond the fact that the trinity constitutes God, a person, it has nothing to do with the Deity of Jesus."

(Page 119) "I had seen the dear human face of God and at the same time it was the face of my mother." (This is his idea of incarnation.) Simply expression through a human being.

(Page 121) "God never speaks an audible word except through one of his bodies in which he has enfolded a human spirit." (This is Dr. Swain. But God spoke on Sinai and at Pentecost and Paul says God spoke to him.)

(Page 123) "If the union of God and man as realized in Jesus was so beautiful, a similar union between God and all men would be equally beautiful." (This is very adroit. But the subtle meaning is that all men could become as much Deity as Jesus was if they would. This he clearly states further on Page 169. "So multitudes feed upon the body of the universe with no thought of what its animating will might be to them.")

(Page 170) "I have simply learned to see the universe that is the present energy of an intelligent will."

(Page 171) "I believe in neither a muck world nor a ghost God. My universe has come to be a will in action." (That is he does not believe in either a material world or a spiritual God.) God to his way of thinking is the animating force of the universe.

(Page 207) "In my opinion the Bible is just about one-half true."

(Page 209) "To believe that its religious value is destroyed if the Bible contains error in history and science is a position as dangerous as it is false."

It is very easily observed that according to this man's moral philosophy, a lie is as effective in teaching religion as the truth. This is consistent with modernists. Hence they remain in orthodox denominations by a program of

camouflage. But Jesus said, "The truth shall make you free." Yet this man was invited to address students in a supposed orthodox college by a supposed orthodox bishop and his books were recommended to the ministers at the conference by this same bishop and sold and read widely.

Quoting from another author whose name we withhold, "The universe discloses itself as a form of energy which is orderly, rational and purposeful;" that is to say the universe has law, mind and intelligent design and then says, "These are the attributes that we associate with God." That is, to his mind the universe is God. This is perfectly consistent with the theory of evolution for, if the universe produced man with his intelligence, will, emotions, and psychic powers, etc.,—which is in accordance with Mr. Tyndall's definition of evolution—then it is absurd to reason that the universe is not as intelligent as the being it produced; and this is the modernist's idea of God.

How different from all this is the God of the Bible! "In the beginning God." "Before the mountains were brought forth or even Thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting thou art God." The God of the Bible understands the science of mathematics.

"Who hath measured the waters in the hollow of his hand and meted out heaven with a span and comprehended the dust of the earth in a measure and weighed the mountains in scales and the hills in a balance." But he exists separate from his creation though manifest by it and he will still exist when suns have cindered and moons have turned to blood.

"As a vesture shalt thou fold them up and they shall be changed but thou art the same and thy years shall not fail." The God of the Bible is intelligent. He can speak. He hears prayer. He works miracles for the deliverance of those who put their trust in him. He is a God of mercy and love. He is also a God of justice and will by no means clear the guilty. This latter attribute is the reason why the modernists prefer the Pantheistic God of their own making. Their God is impersonal, unfeeling, unknowable, never speaks, never goes or comes. Hence they feel that they can live as they wish and there is no danger that their God will call them to an account. But their god has no semblance of likeness to the God of the Bible and of Christians.

A young gentleman named Horace Boltz, some fifteen years ago, attended a large number of the colleges of the country, and in a series of articles in one of the popular magazines gave a review of what our colleges and educators were teaching the student life of our nation. He closed the series, by saying that the educators in our schools and colleges had led God to the rim of the universe and politely bowed Him out. College presidents and professors protested, and even conservative orthodoxy thought him very extreme. But the past ten years have demonstrated that he was right, and that modernism has no God in the Christian or Bible sense of the word.

Well might the modernists write in their creed, the words of one of the greatest exponents of the theory that is basic to their religious propaganda, as he was nearing the end of the trail. "I find neither God above nor soul within. All is but the changeless flow of unguided matter in motion, the abyss is the only fatherhood to be

found; God, if there be a God, is unknowable, impersonal, unfeeling and unapproachable."

When a religion is wrong on the Deity, it is wrong on every other fundamental.

MODERNISM REJECTS THE ENTIRE BIBLE

Our next charge against modernism is that, under the pretense of rejecting those parts of the Bible where there is a supposed conflict with science, it rejects the entire Bible, and with it the Deity of Christ. You cannot separate these two propositions—the Deity of Christ, and the authoritative inspiration of the holy scriptures. To accept one of these propositions is to accept both. To reject either is to reject both.

The Bible, containing sixty-six separate compositions or books, the time of its authorship covering nearly two thousand years, is so thoroughly woven together, the unity of its purpose is so clear, that, if you discard one portion of the book, you must discard the whole. Our modernist friends tell us that, if we accept evolution, we must reject the historicity of Genesis. Agreed. They tell us further that evolution has nothing to do with religious standards and ideals. Let us see. Jesus says Genesis was history. "Have ye not read that he which made them at the beginning made them male and female?"

Notice Jesus did not say that at the beginning they were a germ, but a fully developed man and woman capable of reproducing their kind and guarded by sacred marriage relations. Jesus said this, and the evolutionists are not at present in possession of one single fact that refutes the statement. If they are, let them produce it. Right here evolutionists tell us that faith in the Mosaic authorship of the first five books of the Bible has nothing

whatever to do with faith in Jesus. But Jesus said it had. "For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me; for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings how shall ye believe my words?" Jesus put his stamp upon the historicity of the flood. He said, "But as the days of Noah were, so shall the coming of the Son of man be. For, as in the days that were before the flood, they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noah entered into the ark." But here again our modernists are very clever and they tell us that Jesus simply accepted the current opinions and teachings that were common in His times. And some of them even go so far as to say that, while He was a good man and a Divine Savior, He nevertheless was mistaken about some things. Exactly! That is just where their philosophy leads them to. If they believe in the primal cell theory, all things and beings have the same origin. Their god is a germ god, immanent in matter and not separate from matter. God, then, to the modernist, is simply force manifested in matter. When the modernist tells you that he believes in the divinity of Christ he usually only means that he believes that Christ was divine as all men are divine and all things are divine.

He usually does not believe that Christ was divine in that unique sense in which no other man ever was divine; that he was God manifested in the flesh, and consequently he does not believe that Christ was an infallible teacher. And, with his rejection of the inspiration and credibility of the Bible, he rejects the Deity of Christ. For, if Jesus Christ was God, then he knew whether Genesis was fact or fiction, and he asserted that it was a historic account of the creation of man. All through the Old and New Testaments, prophets, apostles,

and Jesus himself, ascribed creation to a direct act of an omnipotent God. And Jesus put the stamp and seal of His omniscient knowledge on the authority, authenticity, and inspiration of the Old Testament Scriptures. Accept the unproved theories of evolution if you want to, but when you do, discard your Bibles and cease to call yourselves Christians. For one, I do not propose to give up my Bible which gives an account of the creation that no scientific theory has ever proved to be untrue, that is the foundation of the best system of law and ethics that the world has ever had, that reveals a Christ that has provided a salvation which can put away sin, and that meets every desire of my heart, and satisfies every spiritual demand of my life; that gives me a hope of immortality and fills me with anticipation of the future that is radiant—for any unproved scientific theory—even though modernists should speak of me as a religious bigot, or regard me as a back number.

I am aware that modernists will challenge the position I have taken relative to the statements that Jesus made confirming the historicity of Genesis, because Jesus confessed not to know the time of His second coming. Personally, I do not believe that Jesus here confessed a limitation on His knowledge. Some of the foremost Greek scholars say that the word *knoweth* is used where the word *revealed* should have been. And that Jesus only stated that as the matter of his second coming had not been revealed by the Father even to the angels, He would not reveal it, and this perfectly harmonizes with other statements of the Scripture. Second, the King James version and American version do not agree. And the American revisors append a note saying that many of the oldest manuscripts do not contain the words

"Neither the Son." However, without going into a lengthy argument as to what constitutes personality, it is certain that memory is one of the constituent faculties of personality. If Jesus Christ was Deity, as the Scriptures clearly affirm, then His Person existed from all eternity and His memory carried Him back to that time spoken of as the beginning. This He positively affirmed. He said, "Before Abraham was I am." If we admit that He existed as a Divine Person before His incarnation, then we must admit that He had perfect knowledge of all things that occurred before His incarnation, and to question His perfect knowledge relative to creation and to the divine inspiration of the Bible is to question His Deity.

We further assert that it is absurd for the modernist to pretend that he believes either in the inspiration of the Bible or the deity of Christ if he accepts the evolutionary theory of creation. For pantheism, which means God and the universe and human souls are all one entity, excludes miracles, the immaculate conception, the God Man, and hence the Deity of Christ; all are cut from the same cloth; all are under the same inevitable law; all progressing toward the same goal—the abyss, Nirvana, annihilation—our final and inevitable destination. And when life is over, "Drop the curtain, the farce is ended."

Our next proposition is that modernism rejects the Bible doctrine of sin and the atonement.

Modernism has not gone to all the trouble of attempting to prove that Genesis is unscientific simply in the interest of truth and veracity. There has been method in their madness. The objectionable feature in Genesis has been that it teaches the fall of man, and the

doctrine of original sin. A favorite expression with modernists is, "If man ever fell, he fell upward." He may believe in sin in a certain qualified sense. He may talk about sin in concrete life, meaning social, political or commercial injustice. But he does not believe "that all men were conceived and born in sin." He does not believe what the scripture means by being "dead in trespasses and in sins." And hence his views of the atonement are apt to be sadly distorted. He may believe that in some sense the death of Christ was the supreme sacrifice, and that it exerts a certain moral influence in leading men to become reconciled to God, but he does not believe that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; He that knew no sin was made sin for us that we might become the righteousness of God in Him." He does not believe in the vicarious atonement. Hear the words of Mr. Fosdick: "We have an ethical Christ, not a sacrificial Christ. Don't offend our sensibilities with talk about the blood of Christ." While Professor Kent goes him one better and says, "It is just as sensible to talk about the wool of the lamb as the blood of the lamb."

HOW TO DETECT MODERNISM

Modernism is most easily detected not by what it teaches, but by what it does not teach. It does teach high standards of morality for which it does not have the least foundation in its moral philosophy. It does exalt Jesus as the example of supreme goodness, placing him at the height of human achievement. And very seldom is it bold enough to speak out in opposition to orthodox doctrines. The burden of its message is ethical culture. Its preaching is of the inspirational type. It

does not propose to put all the cards on the table unless forced to do so. A modernist of the bolder type said during the Scopes trial, that for twenty years all ministers educated in college, or who had access to books written by intelligent authors, had known that Genesis was not history, that the book of Job was an allegory, and that Jonah was an ancient myth. But he said, "The ministers have been withholding these facts from the common people because they did not like to offend pious folk, and there was plenty of preaching material elsewhere." He said that Mr. Bryan's ignorance was due to the fact that his Presbyterian ministers had withheld the truth from him. In other words, the ministers had been assuming to be true, what they knew was falsehood. A very serious charge, but he made it.

If you watch modernists closely you will find that they are significantly silent on the following themes: The divine inspiration and authority of the holy Scriptures, the doctrine of eternal future punishment, the great assize, the second coming of Jesus, the virgin birth, the deity of Christ, the resurrection of the body, the person and work of the Holy Spirit, the doctrine of regeneration, and entire sanctification, the blood atonement for sin, and the fall of man.

Recently I glanced through the pages of "The Age of Reason," by Thomas Paine. My eyes very soon detected this significant statement, "I propose in these pages to set forth the things I do not believe, and why I do not believe them." Significant indeed and it could be consistently appropriated by the modernists of the present time. Their doctrine is a negation. There has been very little effort made to convict modernists of heresy, and very little success in convicting those who

have been arraigned before ecclesiastical courts, for, with the exception of a few outstanding leaders, they have not been preaching heresy, unless it be in very small doses and at intervals far between. Their heresy consists in what they do not preach. They exalt Christian living and Christian morals, but what of it. So did Julian the Apostate exhort the worshippers in heathen temples to imitate Christian philanthropy and virtues. Their entire teaching negates Christian doctrine. They are not simply wrong on methods of interpretation. They are fundamentally wrong. Their entire program is constructed on the principle of that philosophy that teaches that man originated from lower forms of life and is an evolving creature. According to this philosophy, man does not need a redemptive salvation. All he needs is a chance to evolve. The entire Christian system of doctrine, ethics, and destiny is based upon the teaching of the Bible; that man was created in the image of God; that he is now a fallen being; that he must have a blood redemption as provided in Christ; that God as the ruler of the universe gave the law which is the foundation of all ethics; and that man may by his acceptance or rejection of the divine plan of salvation fix his own destiny for weal or woe. These are positions as widely separated as east from west, as north from south, as heaven from hell. Modernism is not Christianity in any sense of the word.

It has much in common with all heathen religions, but absolutely nothing in common with the religion of Jesus of Nazareth. But some one asks, "Are not their morals and philanthropy and social uplift distinctly Christian?" Our answer is "No." They are only the sheep's clothing that hides the carnivorous tooth of the

wolf. That their teaching and morals have been imbibed from Christian culture and parentage we do not deny. That there are many refined, courteous, virtuous people among them goes without saying. But these virtues are not the product of their philosophy, nor can they continue to exist under its teaching. Mr. Wells made a very significant statement when he said, "Now that the Bible must be discarded because of its unscientific teaching," (I suppose he meant because it conflicted with his history) "another Bible would have to be written to build and maintain civilization." Modernism neither has, nor can it have any infallible standards of righteousness, that became a foundation for a system of ethics that is Christian in any sense of the word. Take their doctrine of the Divine immanence. This means that God and the universe are identical. Take the materialistic view as expressed by Herbert Spencer. "All is but the ceaseless flow of matter in motion." Who has any right to be a lawgiver here? And who is there capable of being governed by law, or that needs to be so governed?

Or, take the philosophy that inclines to idealism. What appears to be matter is not matter at all, but electrons or electricity in extreme agitation, and hence a spiritual universe, and assume as modernists do, that man is cut from the same cloth as the universe, bone of its bone, flesh of its flesh, spirit of its spirit. Who, we ask, gave one electron a right to dictate to another electron? If there is no supreme being there is no supreme authority with no standard of ethics, moral chaos is inevitable.

Not only is there no standard of ethics in modernism, but fundamentally their philosophy is immoral in its teaching. New England Unitarianism inherited the very

highest of ethics and culture, and boasted that their special mission was to teach ethics in practical life. But a hundred years of Unitarianism has been a sad disillusionment as to how a church rejecting the authoritative inspiration of the Bible was to maintain its standard of ethics. The late Professor William James is quoted by Earnest Gordon as saying, "I have been a citizen of Cambridge for many years and in my time there has been in Eastern Massachussetts no enterprise of public or private rascality that has not been organized by a Harvard graduate." While Mr. Gordon himself says, "When a student of alcohol intrigues I was often struck with the way in which Harvard men were directly or indirectly serving the interests of that basest of organizations, the U. S. Brewers Association." Some of their leaders are now proposing a Unitarian union with *Mohammedanism*. Good and well. There may be, however, a question as to whether Unitarians are now sufficiently orthodox as to one God, or their standard of morals sufficiently high to make them admissible to that hoary order of the east. Unitarian leaders are constantly declaring that their position is exactly that of the modernists. The modernists, of course, are objecting seriously to this claim. That would be a give away, and defeat the subtle purpose of the modernists to get into possession of the church's periodicals, educational institutions, and congregations of orthodoxy where they can successfully fleece the orthodox sheep to support the modernists' propaganda. They are succeeding remarkably well at this undertaking because some of their orthodox brethren are too charitable to expose them. To return to the subject of modernist morals, the late Mr. Bryan in his speech that he prepared, but did not deliver, ("He was not, for

God took him"), showed that evolution was a bloody immoral doctrine. Mr. Bryan quoted Mr. Darrow's own words to show that Mr. Darrow defended Leopold and Loeb on the grounds that they had imbibed the evolutionary philosophy of Nietzsche, and that Nietzsche's philosophy of the super-man, taught cold blooded heartless murder, if such were necessary for the evolution of the human race. Mr. Darrow said that books containing this philosophy were to be found in and were being taught to a great extent in all the schools and colleges of the land. And Mr. Darrow contended that these young scapegraces were no more to blame than the professors who taught them this philosophy, and then said, he did not think the professors were to blame. What is this but justification for murder in the first degree? What is this but the doctrine of the survival of the fittest that drenched Europe with blood in the most atrocious war of all human history? Our present civilization is founded upon the supposition that the state exists for the protection and welfare of the individual. All this is said to be biologically wrong. According to the philosophy of evolution, the individual exists for the welfare of the state, and can be justly dispensed with at any time when his existence is not for the best interests of the state. Benjamin Kidd, in "The Science of Power," tells of being present at a great gathering of scientists in London for the discussion of the subject of eugenics.

"There were present at the meeting in London at which Galton read his paper many representative men of the times, politicians, publicists, professors of many subjects, doctors of many sciences, authors representing various branches of literature. The chair was occupied by Professor Karl Pearson, now holding the Professorship of

Eugenics, which Galton soon after founded in the University of London. As I walked out into the Strand from the room in the London School of Economics in which the meeting had been held, I well remember the state of my mind. *I found myself looking around in the street for the face of a child to restore me again to the feeling and to the atmosphere of civilization.* For my dominant mental impression was that *never before had I been so nearly in touch with the mind and with the standards of primitive man.*

"For 'Socialists,' said Karl Pearson, 'have to inculcate that spirit which would give offenders against the State short shrift and the nearest lamppost. Every citizen must learn to say with Louis XIV, l'etat c'est moi' (I am the state). These are his words. Nothing more. From the apostle of eugenics in his ideal socialist state short shrift and the nearest lamppost for the offender at the hands of the bystander!" This means execution without trial.

"Mr. Bateson proceeded in his lecture to sweep aside all views of civilization founded on the conception that the state existed for the protection of the individual. They were, he said, biologically false. *'The only instinct,'* he asserted, *'which is sufficiently universal to supply the motive for exertion in civilization is the desire to accumulate property in the competitive struggle.'*

"Mr. Bateson asserted, therefore, that in civilization in the future, again to repeat his words, 'The aim of social reform must be, not to abolish class, but to provide that each individual shall so far as possible get into the right class and stay there, and usually his children after him.'

"Mr. Bateson proposed to begin comparatively mildly with the feeble-minded. To use his words, 'The union of such social vermin we should no more permit than we should allow parasites to breed on our own bodies.' Think of referring to human beings as *vermin*."

"On reading through these lectures of Mr. Bateson it is almost as if we saw in imagination the primitive man of past aeons of time presenting himself before a congress of civilization, holding again a dripping head in one hand and an ensanguined spear in the other, and, entirely unconscious of the meaning of all the vast struggles for human liberties, demanding in the name of science the restoration of that primal law of the jungle by which the fittest to secure property in the fight survived and transmitted his qualities, all subsequent social conditions being as founded in natural falsehood."

In these statements you have an example of the working out in social life of this moral, or rather immoral philosophy which is fundamental to the development of the human race according to the hypothesis of evolution. Could anything be more dangerous to civilization or more damning to morality? Many theologians of liberal type would protest, that "We believe in and teach no such philosophy." Of course, you do not, but this philosophy is fundamental to the theory of evolution, for which you have surrendered the postulates of the infallible word of God, and accepted the speculations of modernism. We repeat the statement that modernism has no *infallible* standards of righteousness.

Shalier Mathews, dean of Theology, Chicago University, says, "But for men who think of God as dynamically immanent in an infinite universe, who think of man's relation to him as determined not by statutory, but by

cosmic law, who regard sin and righteousness alike as the working out of fundamental forces of life itself, the conception of God as king and of man as a condemned or acquitted subject is but a figure of speech."

Modernism is a wrong philosophy of life and religion, based upon an unproven theory of evolution. Its program and propaganda are deceptive. It negates every fundamental principle of Christianity in doctrine and morals. It will, if unhindered, leaven the entire church and world with its nefarious teaching and plunge the world back into heathenism. It is not Christian in any sense of the word. It is heathen both in its philosophy and in its morals.

Beyond debate, "The Christian Century" is the outstanding journal of modernism in America. In an editorial of January 3, 1924, this journal says: "Christianity, according to fundamentalism, is one religion. Which is the true religion? is the question that is to be settled in all probability by our generation for future generations. There is a clash here as profound and as grim as between Christianity and Confucianism. Amiable words cannot hide the differences. 'Blest be the tie' may be sung till doomsday, but it cannot bind these worlds together. The God of the fundamentalist is one God; the God of the modernist is another. The Bible of the fundamentalist is one Bible; the Bible of modernism is another. The church, the kingdom, the salvation, the consummation of all things—these are one thing to fundamentalists and another thing to modernists. Which God is the Christian God, which Christ is the Christian Christ, which Bible is the Christian Bible, which church, which kingdom, which salvation, which consummation are the

Christian church, the Christian consummation? The future will tell."

But why contend? Why cause all this conflict and disturbance? Why fill the minds of the common folk with this wrangle about matters of which they are blissfully ignorant? Lack of information on the part of the common people on this subject is their peril. It was while men slept that the enemy sowed tares in the field. Many of our public school teachers have imbibed the theories of evolution from institutions where they have been educated. The youth of the land are more under the influence of the day school teacher than they are of the parents. And here as well as in much of the Sunday school literature of the times, our mere babies as well as young people are imbibing theories relative to the Bible, God and creation that are wrecking their faith.

My first reason for advocating contention is that it is scriptural. "It was needful for me to write unto you and exhort you that ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints." "As we said before, so say I now again. If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed."

My second reason for contention is that, this is the very thing the modernists do not want. I learned long ago that if I could find out what the liquor men wanted, I could safely take the other side of the issue. Modernists are not asleep on the job, and they understand very well that to put their program across they must keep the common people ignorant of their devices. A modernist pastor said, "After preaching for three years, one of my intelligent members called my attention to the fact that in all this time I had not preached once on 'The

blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth us from all sin'." Then he said, "I saw that I had been discovered."

This modernist wolf, if allowed to remain unmolested in the sheepfold, is as meek as a lamb, but expose him, and contest his rights and you will immediately discover the carnivorous teeth. Modernism thrives and prospers when let alone. About twenty years ago the late Bishop Warren stated in an address before the Methodist General Conference: "We are too strong and vital to feel the effects of modernism." A few years ago Bishop Berry said: "We say there is no conflict in Methodism on the subject of modernism. The only reason for this is that we have not men of sufficient courage and ability to contend. Most of our educational institutions, periodicals, and leading pastorates are in the hands of modernists."

I question very much whether in all the subtle propaganda of modernism there is a more dangerous feature than that which cries persecution at the least attempt at exposure of their covert plans by fundamentalists. They compare themselves to heroes and martyrs of the past who suffered persecution for the sake of truth. They compare themselves to Paul and other Apostles who were persecuted. There is no more similarity between these battle-scarred veterans of the cross and the sleek, cultured, well-groomed, well-salaried modernists who try to retain their positions and standing in orthodox churches, attempt to get control of institutions and property built by orthodox ministers and paid for and supported by funds raised from orthodox Christians, than there was between Judas Iscariot and his Lord.

But the question is asked, "Have not the modernists a right to their opinions and theories?"

Certainly, they have. Our protest is against their attempt to propagate them, while orthodox money furnishes the munitions of war.

Some tell us to let modernism alone; to contend only spreads their error. But have we anything to fear from the light? I have noticed that when ministers make the assertion, "I am neither fundamentalist nor modernist," one will usually find that their orthodoxy will not stand investigation. Every modernist knows that the credo, "nothing at stake," is fundamental to modernism. I challenge you to find any instance in history where great moral or spiritual reform has been brought about without contention. This leaven of the Pharisees is fast leavening the Church, the youth, the institutions of learning, and the State. Wherever this poison stream flows, moral and spiritual death creeps on like fever follows the miasma of the swamps. The words of James Russell Lowell are as appropriate in this case, as they were in the one for which they were written,

"Once to every man and nation comes the moment to decide,
In the strife of truth with falsehood for the good or evil side.
Some great cause, God's new Messiah, offering each the bloom or
blight,

Parts the goats upon the left hand, and the sheep upon the right.
And the choice goes by forever, 'twixt that darkness and that
light,

Silent seems the great avenger, history's pages but record
One death grapple in the darkness, 'twixt old system, and the
Word,

Truth forever on the scaffold, Wrong forever on the throne
Yet the scaffold sways the future, and behind the dim unknown
Standeth God within the shadows, keeping watch upon His own."

The End.

GOULD LIBRARY
EASTERN NAZARENE COLLEGE

NEASE LIBRARY EASTERN NAZARENE COLLEGE
BT78 .B46 GOULD
Bennett, W. G./Modernism with the mask o



3 2999 00042 6630

